

Remarks/Arguments:

Amendments

Claims 3 and 35 has been amended to correct misspelled words. Claims 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 19 have been amended to change dependency. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found on page 5, line 33, to page 6, line 4, and page 11, lines 3-8. Support for the amendment to claim 37 is found on page 13, lines 22-24. Support for new claim 38 is found in original claims 1 and 6, on page 13, lines 24-25, and on page 18, lines 19-20. Support for new claims 39-41 is found in original claims 3-5, respectively. Support for new claim 42 is found in original claim 6. Support for new claims 43 and 46 is found on page 6, lines 21-23, and on page 10, line 30, to page 11, line 2. Support for new claims 44 and 47 is found on page 6, lines 21-23, and on page 10, line 30, to page 11, line 2. Support for new claims 45 and 48 is found on page 13, lines 22-24.

It is submitted that no new matter is introduced by these amendments and new claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 6 was indicated allowable, but objected to. New claim 38 is claim 6 rewritten in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 1 on which it depended, except that the specific crosslinking agents have not been recited. The specific crosslinking agents are recited in new claim 42. It is submitted that new claim 38, and new claims 39-42, dependent thereon, are in condition for immediate allowance.

Claim Objection

Claim 35 has been amended to correct a misspelled word. It is submitted that this objection has been overcome.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-4, 7-9, and 15-17 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-3, 14, and 19 of U.S. Patent 5,772,905, in view of Napoli, U.S. Patent 4,731,155 ("Napoli"). It is respectfully pointed out that in the previous communication claims 7 and 9 were canceled.

The Office asserts that claims 1-3, 14, and 19 of U.S. Patent 5,772,905, disclose thermal plastic polymers. Office action, page 3, lines 3-4. The Office also asserts that Napoli discloses thermal plastic polymers. Office action, page 3, lines 5-8.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "the polymeric composition comprises an added composition selected from the group consisting of (1) thermosettable polymeric compositions, (2) photocurable polymeric compositions, (3) combinations of thermosettable polymeric compositions and photocurable polymeric compositions, and (4) combinations of thermoplastic polymeric compositions with either thermosettable polymeric compositions, photocurable polymeric compositions, or combinations of thermosettable polymeric compositions and photocurable polymeric compositions."

The Office has not asserted that any of the polymeric compositions recited in amended claim 1 is disclosed by either claims 1-3, 14, and 19 of U.S. Patent 5,772,905, or by Napoli. Therefore, the Office has not made the *prima facie* case because combination of claims 1-3, 14, and 19 of U.S. Patent 5,772,905 with Napoli does not produce the invention recited in amended claim 1. The nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claim 1, and the claims dependent thereon, as unpatentable over claims 1-3, 14, and 19 of U.S. Patent 5,772,905 in view of Napoli should be withdrawn.

First Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1-2, 16-17, 19, 30-31, and 34-45 were rejected as unpatentable over Jan Haisma, *et al.*, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B, 14(6), 4124-4128 (Nov/Dec. 1996) ("Haisma"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Haisma was published in Nov/Dec. 1996. The instant application is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Ser. No. 10/301,475, filed on Nov. 21, 2002, which is a continuation of U.S. Ser. No. 09/430,602, filed Oct. 29, 1999, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Ser. No. 09/107,006, filed Jun. 30, 1998, which is a continuation-in-part of U.S. Ser. No. 08/558,809, filed Nov. 15, 1995. That is, the priority date of the instant application is before the publication date of Haisma. Therefore, the Haisma is not available as a reference.

The rejection of claims 1-2, 16-17, 19, 30-31, and 34-45 as unpatentable over Haisma should be withdrawn.

Second Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 3, 10-12, and 14-15 were rejected as unpatentable over Haisma in view of in view of Napoli and further in view of Harmening, Proc. IEEE: Micro Electro Mechanical Systems, 202-207 (1992) ("Harmening"). As discussed above, Haisma is not available as a reference. Therefore the rejection of claims 3, 10-12, and 14-15 as unpatentable over Haisma in view of in view of Napoli and further in view of Harmening should be withdrawn.

Third Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 4, 13, 32-33, and 36-37 were rejected as unpatentable over Haisma and Napoli in view of Yamamura, U.S. Patent 5,981,616 ("Yamamura"). As discussed above, Haisma is not available as a reference. Therefore the rejection of claims 4, 13, 32-33, and 36-37 as unpatentable over Haisma in view of in view of Napoli and further in view of Yamamura should be withdrawn.

Fourth Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 5 was rejected as unpatentable over Haisma and Napoli in view of Ito, U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0102490 A1 ("Ito"). As discussed above, Haisma is not available as a reference. Therefore the rejection of claim 5 as unpatentable over Haisma in view of in view of Napoli and further in view of Ito should be withdrawn.

Fifth Rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

Claim 8 was rejected as unpatentable over Haisma and Napoli in view of Yoshinada, U.S. Patent 5,141,785 ("Yoshinada"). As discussed above, Haisma is not available as a reference. Therefore the rejection of claim 8 as unpatentable over Haisma in view of in view of Napoli and further in view of Yoshinada should be withdrawn.

Extension of Time


The fee for a three-month Extension of Time accompanies this communication.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the claim is in condition for immediate allowance and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to phone applicants' attorney if it is believed that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia


Bruce M. Monroe, Reg. No. 33,602
Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorneys for Applicants

BMM/dlk/alb


Dated: October 4, 2007

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. **18-0350** for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 4, 2007

Ashley Burry



201252v1